



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,132	01/25/2002	Hiroaki Nishiuchi	218070US0PCT	8138
22850	7590	06/22/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MARX, IRENE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1651		

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/030,132	NISHIUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Irene Marx	Art Unit 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 10-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/8/04 has been entered.

Newly submitted claims 16-21 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 10-15 drawn to strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, classified in Class 435, subclass 254.2, for example.

Claims 16-21 drawn to a process of making yeast extract with of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, classified in Class 435, subclass 71.1, for example.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as for a process of obtaining antibodies, as host cells in processes involving the use of recombinant DNA or for the production of hydrolytic enzymes, such as proteases.

The several inventions above are independent and distinct, each from the other. They have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches (as indicated by the different classification). The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Further, a reference which would anticipate the invention of Group I would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the any of the other groups. For these reasons restriction for examination purposes is proper.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 16-21 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

No basis or support is found in the present specification for a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain which produces 1% or more of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and 0.004-0.1% by weight of glutathione during its logarithmic growth phase in a minimal medium.

In the as-filed specification, no strain is found that contains more than 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and which contains more than 0.0045% by weight of glutathione during its logarithmic growth phase in a minimal medium under any circumstances. The only strain that produces the cited yields is strain N $\alpha$ 3 No. 2 (table 1) in a specific minimal medium containing a specific amount of uracil.

It is noted that the originally filed claims contain the term "can contain", which is not proper basis or support for the invention as now claimed, in view of the conditional nature of the original limitation.

Therefore, this material constitutes new matter and should be deleted.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The invention now is directed to strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* having specific properties. It is not clear if the written description is sufficiently repeatable to avoid the need for

a deposit. Further it is unclear if the starting materials were readily available to the public at the time of invention.

It appears that no deposit was made in this application that meets all of the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809. Applicant or applicant's representative may provide assurance of compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, in the following manner.

**SUGGESTION FOR DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL**

A declaration by applicant, assignee, or applicant's agent identifying a deposit of biological material and averring the following may be sufficient to overcome an objection and rejection based on a lack of availability of biological material.

1. Identifies declarant.
2. States that a deposit of the material has been made in a depository affording permanence of the deposit and ready accessibility thereto by the public if a patent is granted. The depository is to be identified by name and address.
3. States that the deposited material has been accorded a specific (recited) accession number.
4. States that all restriction on the availability to the public of the material so deposited will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent.
5. States that the material has been deposited under conditions that access to the material will be available during the pendency of the patent application to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto under 37 CFR 1.14 and 35 U.S.C § 122.
6. States that the deposited material will be maintained with all the care necessary to keep it viable and uncontaminated for a period of at least five years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited microorganism, and in any case, for a period of at least thirty (30) years after the date of deposit for the enforceable life of the patent, whichever period is longer.
7. That he/she declares further that all statements made therein of his/her own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true, and further that these statements were made with knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the instant patent application or any patent issuing thereon.

Alternatively, it may be averred that deposited material has been accepted for deposit under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the purpose of Patent Procedure (e.g. see 961 OG 21, 1977) and that all restrictions on the

availability to the public of the material so deposited will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent.

Additionally, the deposit must be referred to in the body of the specification and be identified by deposit (accession) number, date of deposit, name and address of the depository and the complete taxonomic description.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant alleges that no deposit is required because the techniques used are so common that a person skilled in the art can obtain the claimed strain using routine experimentation. However, that the techniques are routine cannot be equated with producing a strain having the required properties in a predictable and reproducible manner. Applicant has not demonstrated that it is sufficient to mutagenize a conventional strain by a mutagen treatment to predictably obtain a uracil auxotrophic by culturing the strains on a SDFOA plate. In addition, there is no clear nexus between uracil auxotrophy and the invention as claimed. As a matter of fact, the claimed strain is not uracil auxotrophic. Only in dependent strain claim 21 is the claimed strain auxotrophic for uracil. In addition, that the primers have certain sequences does not assure that a suitable DNA is predictably obtained or that the clones sequences will result in a strain having the properties functionally claimed. It is apparent that more than SEQ ID NO: 1 and SEQ ID NO: 2 are required to construct the claimed strain. For example, at page 23 the primers are indicated as having SEQ ID NO: 8 and SEQ ID NO: 9. The nature of these sequences and of all of the intervening sequences SEQ ID NO: 3 through 7 is unclear.

There is no clear correlation between the properties claimed and the alleged conventional techniques to assure one skilled in the art that the claimed strain can be obtained. The claims are broadly drawn to a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* which produces 1% or more of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and 0.004-0.1% by weight of glutathione during its logarithmic growth phase in a minimal medium. In contrast, the specification discloses strains No. 3 No. 1 and No. 2 (Table 1), which produce 0.0043 and 0.0045 % glutathione which strains are produced by an elaborate and specific protocol. Strain No. 3 No. 2 contains 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and 0.0045% by weight of glutathione when grown in a specific minimal medium containing uracil.

However, in the as-filed specification, no strain is found that contains more than 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and which contains more than 0.0045% by weight of glutathione, during its logarithmic growth phase and no guidance is provided to produce such a strain.

Applicant has not provided suitable objective evidence to demonstrate that strains as claimed are reproducibly obtainable or, alternatively, that the strains as claimed are readily available to the public as required by the statute.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are broadly drawn to a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* which produces 1% or more of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and 0.004-0.1% by weight of glutathione during its logarithmic growth phase in a minimal medium. In contrast, the specification only provides guidance obtaining strains which are at least auxotrophic for uracil and need this material in the medium at a specific concentration. In the as-filed specification, no strain is found that contains more than 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and which contains more than 0.0045% by weight of glutathione for N $\alpha$ 3 No. 2 during its logarithmic growth phase in a specific minimal medium containing uracil. The specification discloses strains N $\alpha$ 3 No. 1 and No. 2 (Table 1), which are produced by an elaborate and specific protocol, using specific vectors and sequences. Strain N $\alpha$ 3 No. 2 contains 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and 0.0045% by weight of glutathione when grown in a specific minimal medium containing uracil. However, in the as-filed specification, no strain is found that contains more than 1.117% by weight of  $\gamma$ -glutamylcysteine and which contains more than 0.0045% by weight of glutathione, during its logarithmic growth phase and no guidance is provided to produce such a strain.

Therefore, claims 10-15 lack an adequate written description in the specification as filed.

In addition, no strains as claimed appear to be readily available to the public as required by the statute.

Given the claim breadth and lack of guidance as discussed above, the specification fails to provide an adequate written description of the claimed invention.

See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997), which teaches that the disclosure of a process for obtaining cDNA from a particular organism and the description of the encoded protein fail to provide an adequate written description of the actual cDNA from that organism which would encode the protein from that organism, despite the disclosure of a cDNA encoding that protein from another organism.

See Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016 at 1021 and 1027, (Fed. Cir. 1991) at page 1021, where it is taught that a gene (or promoter) is not reduced to practice until the inventor can define it by "its physical or chemical properties" (e.g. a DNA sequence), and at page 1027, where it is taught that the disclosure of a few gene sequences did not enable claims broadly drawn to any analog thereof.

Claims 10-15 are allowable over the art of record.

Claims directed specifically to strains Nα3 No. 1 and Nα3 No. 2 would be allowable upon full compliance with the deposit requirements.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (571) 272-0919. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Irene Marx*  
Irene Marx  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1651